



**APPROVED** Minutes of the **SPECIAL MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Monday, November 3, 2014, in the Public Meeting Room of the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.

**PRESENT:** Chairman Grover, Members Gulatee, Hardnock, Kennerley and Schlecht.

**ABSENT:** Trustee Liaison McDonough.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Steve McNellis, Community & Economic Development Director.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Grover called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

**1.0 ROLL CALL**

The roll was called by **Director McNellis** and **Chairman Grover** declared a quorum to be present.

**2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Architectural Review Board Meeting held Tuesday, October 21, 2014.

**Member Hardnock** moved and **Member Gulatee** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Architectural Review Board held on October 21, 2014, as presented. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

**3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:**

3.1 Continued Consideration and Discussion of a Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Building Elevations, Materials and Colors, and site lighting for a proposed four-level parking structure at 25/75 Tri-State International Office Center (Trammell Crow Company/Principal Real Estate Investors).

**Director McNellis** presented a recap of the September and October ARB meetings regarding this subject. He also thanked the ARB on behalf of Staff and the Petitioner for the member's accommodation of this special meeting this evening, given the Petitioner's tight time frame for moving forward.

**Grady Hamilton** of Trammell Crow Company, representing Owner Principal Real Estate Investors, began the Petitioner's presentation by introducing their team. He also thanked the ARB for their flexibility and time in scheduling tonight's meeting.

**Architect Roger Heerema** of Wright Heerema Architects, presented the details of the entire plan set. He noted at the last meeting there was some discussion regarding the pedestrian path from the north stairwell of the parking deck to the office building. He further noted they had put in a walkway along the side of the parking deck and striped-out an area across the drive, leading to the building entrance.



**Project Landscape Architect David McCallum**, Principal of David R. McCallum Associates, noted there had been a comment at the last meeting regarding adding more evergreen plants at entrances and at the perimeter of the parking structure. The plan now shows evergreen groundcover and medium-height evergreen shrubs that would be 4' tall at the time of planting and about 5' tall at maturity, interspersed in groups along the east elevation of the parking deck. Landscape Architect McCallum also noted the existing honeylocust trees along the east property line, adjacent to the Tollway on-ramp, would remain.

**Project Architect Heerema** stated there was some discussion at the last meeting about how the area between the deck and the existing office building will be developed. He noted the existing trees along the building, in this area, will remain. He went on to describe the details added prior to the October 21<sup>st</sup> meeting to break-up the parking deck east façade. This was done through the introduction of glass towers and metal fins, painted black. These were added to give the deck some sense of scale. This is ornamentation not found on typical parking decks. **Project Architect Heerema** further pointed out the sections have been revised to accurately portray the Tollway on-ramp in relation to the parking deck.

**Project Architect Heerema** stated the parking deck would have a slightly deeper color, so it is clear they are not trying to exactly match the office building. He stated they wanted to be sure to avoid a "near miss" in building color, so they decided to deliberately make it a shade darker.

**Project Architect Heerema** stated there had been a lot of conversation previously about the other options they had considered, so they have provided those studies in the packet this evening. The first question was did they look at an option with a deck on the north side of the site? Architect Heerema noted that initially looked viable, though the parking location was too remote with parking so far away from the main buildings. In that scheme, called Option A, the parking deck was 10' taller than the office building itself, and had seven level of parking. The prospective tenant was not comfortable with the lack of accessibility to the office buildings.

**Member Gulatee** inquired if Option A creates additional setback issues. **Director McNellis** stated that this option could end up with a new interior side yard setback exception and a more intense front yard setback exception along the Tollway. Zoning exceptions would be necessary for this option, but they are already requesting them for their preferred option anyway. As a result, regardless of which option is chosen, exceptions will be necessary.

**Project Architect Heerema** stated this option also affects the loading area on the north side of 25 Tri-State, which would then require that loading area to be relocated to the east side of the office building. **Member Gulatee** inquired if this option displaced less parking, given the deck's smaller footprint. **Project Architect Heerema** concurred, but also stated the net addition of spaces is the same, but there would simply be less spaces in the deck.



**Project Architect Heerema** moved on to Option B. He noted they had previously talked about this stepped scheme. This proposal goes from three levels on the south, to 4 and then 5 levels on the north.

**Project Architect Heerema** then moved on to Option C. He noted the proposal to place the deck in the center of the site means it is not necessarily centralized to the concentration of need. This option would further block views from the Tollway, and provide circulation challenges. **Mr. Hamilton** noted Option C really obscures the 75 and 100 buildings. However, the real problem is in the next scheme (Option D) where parking is challenged, given its location. **Project Architect Heerema** moved on to Option D. he noted that the parking ends up on the wrong end of the site from a functional perspective. He then moved on to Option E. He noted that slipping the deck in between the 75 and 100 buildings affects circulation and the deck gets very close in proximity to those other buildings. Finally, he talked about the photos of other precedents in the Metro Area. He shared examples along highways in Naperville, Oak Brook, Downers Grove and Rosemont, all with similar parking deck locations. With regard to member Gulatee's concerns about the proximity between the building and parking deck, **Project Architect Heerema** shared an example of the Cisco building, a parking deck and building with similar setbacks. **Member Gulatee** countered by stating that providing daylight is so important here, so if we can help it, and not put something in front of a building 70' away, let's try to do that.

**Chairman Grover** stated we have five options plus the developer's Preferred option. He inquired as to whether or not the developer had a second preference beside their Preferred choice? **Project Architect Heerema** stated they feel their Preferred option is the best option and is also the one the Tenant prefers. This option has the most going for it and the least number of reasons against putting it in that location. He further noted that in terms of any future re-use of the building, this would be the optimal solution.

**Chairman Grover** asked if the ARB could discuss location and what the ARB's thoughts are. He stated he did not want the ARB to get hung up on whether there should or should not be a deck. Rather, he suggested they discuss the designs that have been presented and comment on them. **Member Gulatee** noted this is a beautiful campus, with wonderful articulation. He felt the issue was how the Petitioner could incorporate a deck without devaluing the campus. He noted he had sketched a concept that may work and he'd like to have it passed around to the Petitioner and ARB. The sketch was passed around.

**Chairman Grover** stated he wanted to provide some comments on the Options. He felt that C, D and E are not good and don't work. He further noted he is in favor of the north side locations. He realizes that Option A has its challenges, so he would tend to favor Option B or the developer's Preferred Option. **Member Schlecht** noted his agreement with the Chairman's thoughts. He further stated that this is Lincolnshire's front door, which is why the ARB takes this so seriously. He agreed Option E causes circulation issues. He further wondered why this tenant that wants to be part of the Lincolnshire business community hasn't come forward to be heard from. **Member Schlecht** further inquired if the developer wouldn't simply be back in



five years asking for Option D, on top of this proposal, due to spacing issue in the buildings further south. He agrees Option C blocks too much. Finally, he felt the stepped solution had many of the same concerns he had with the Preferred Option. He noted that his preference was for Option A, as he believed it was the most respectful to the campus. He noted again the Preferred Option is two football fields long and inquired "Is the Preferred Option" really the vision of the architecture of Lincolnshire?"

**Member Kennerley** stated she believed Option A and the Preferred Option are the two best options. Option A doesn't block anything architecturally, but as an employee, with regard to flow, she feels the majority of the people would park outside and avoid the deck. She further stated her belief that the original (Preferred) option has the best flow. Besides, from a management standpoint, she'd rather not have employees looking out the window, so the proximity of the garage shouldn't be a problem. Member Kennerley noted ultimately she believes Option A is not good from a safety standpoint. She doesn't believe Options other than the Preferred Option will work. She believes where the Petitioner has arrived is probably their best option. She also noted she appreciated the glass being used to break-up the façade. Finally, she agreed black fins will provide better integration.

**Member Hardnock** stated he believes Option B overall is the best option. He feels Option A has a lot of issues. He noted if you look at Option B, you're losing about 30% of the view, but if you look west, out of the front of the building, that's where the view is. You wouldn't want to put the deck on the west side where the view is. **Director McNellis** noted there has been a lot of discussion about the proximity of the deck to the office building, but it appears only 35% of the buildings windows look directly at the deck. **Member Schlecht** stated he would argue with that calculation.

**Member Gulatee** stated Option A opens up the view to the 25 and 75 buildings to quite an extent. He wondered if six stories was really too high. He stated he was not convinced by the Petitioner's arguments, and felt Option B helped somewhat.

**Chairman Grover** stated there is a consensus its tough to retrofit this campus. He felt the ARB needed to look at how to fit a structure in here. He wondered if he was correct, from a locational perspective, if there was agreement it should be the location in Options A or B (stepped or Preferred option) as the most appropriate. He further noted that between those two locations, he felt Option B was better. He further inquired as to the glass being contemplated on the east deck elevation. Is it a mirror and will it blind people on the ramp if it is reflective? **Project Architect Heerema** then passed around a glass sample. He noted that this wouldn't be a silver mirrored glass, but would have slight mirrored qualities, even though it is translucent and you can see through it. **Member Gulatee** inquired why glass was used. **Project Architect Heerema** noted they've introduced architectural elements such as glass from the office building.

**Member Schlecht** stated he does not necessarily agree that Option B is the preferred location. He asked why not use bronze tone glass similar to the office building as a further tie-in? **Project Architect Heerema** stated they are trying to



introduce a little bit of variation and difference. Bronze glass could be used but would be very dark. **Member Schlecht** stated there is 600' of pre-cast spancrete parking deck here, where do the fins come from? Project Architect Heerema responded that they looked at a number of things. The fins are used to break down the façade to help sectionalize the deck into smaller units.

**Mr. Hamilton** noted the Preferred Option scheme the team has brought forth is the one that really works. Scheme B was a close second. He noted they considered several options, looked at the constraints and the Preferred Option is the one upon which they need the ARB's reaction. **Member Schlecht** noted there were pros and cons on each side of the building. The image of the Tri-State Center is primarily from the expressway. He inquired if the Petitioner considered doubling the parking, so there is one level of ground parking and then one full second level of parking all across the front of the site along the Tollway? This would be similar to the example of the parking podium at the Downers Grove office building example. This would add proximity to parking for the entire campus. **Project Architect Heerema** stated they did not look at that idea. He felt it was important to consolidate the new parking area next to the buildings its serving. He also felt it became problematic from a cost and utility conflict standpoint.

**Member Gulatee** inquired as to how, in Option B, you could make it more interesting, given that the roof of the deck is being looked down upon. Could you use bollard lighting and landscaping on top? **Mr. Hamilton** noted that Option B is challenging given the cost, circulation issues and it provides a less efficient outcome. He stated they had not evaluated it further because they have determined their Preferred Option, and Option B is not it. Finally, he noted the Preferred Option screens the deck from the neighbors.

**Chairman Grover** asked if there were any issues with the fins. He felt they help break-up the façade. **Member Kennerley** again noted that since the glass on the east façade of the deck will be close to the on-ramp, she wants to make sure the Petitioner ensures its not reflective. **Chairman Grover** also noted that with regard to Option B having the fifth floor, for that reason alone, the Preferred Option with four levels is advantageous.

**Director McNellis** stated he believes the Petitioner is here to request a vote on the option they've put all the detail into, which is the main original, or Preferred, option. The other options were presented to show what else the Petitioner's looked at and how they arrived at where they are. They've discussed why they discounted other options, they're asking for your vote on the main proposal they brought this evening, and if you prefer one other than that option, then you obviously would not vote in favor of it.

**Member Hardnock** inquired if there were any other stipulations the ARB wants to see? No other stipulations were mentioned.

**Chairman Grover** asked if Staff is comfortable with the landscaping as proposed? **Director McNellis** responded staff's position is we are recommending approval of



all facets of the main, Preferred Option, as presented. All of Staff's recommendations and requests have been met.

**Member Kennerley** had one comment regarding a recommendation on landscaping in which she suggested that evergreen trees be moved from areas in front of the glass towers on the east elevation and placed on either side of those glass areas.

**Chairman Grover** requested a motion.

*Member Hardnock moved and Member Kennerley seconded a motion to approve, and recommend to the Village Board for their approval the site development plans, including; Site Plan, landscape Plan, Building Elevations, Building Materials and Colors, and Site Lighting for a proposed four-level parking structure at the 25/75 Tri-State International Office Center, as presented in a presentation packet, dated November 3, 2014, and further subject to the following two stipulations:*

- 1) Evergreen trees shown in front of glass wall towers along the Tollway On-Ramp shall be relocated on either side of the glass wall towers.*
- 2) Glass wall towers facing the Tollway On-Ramp shall consist of a minimal-glare/minimal-reflectivity material*

**Chairman Grover** requested a voice vote: Gulatee – Nay, Hardnock – Aye, Kennerley – Aye, Schlecht – Nay, Chairman Grover – Aye. The motion passes by a vote of 3-2.

- 4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)**
- 5.0 NEW BUSINESS (None)**
- 6.0 CITIZENS COMMENTS (None)**
- 7.0 ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, **Chairman Grover** requested an adjournment, to which all members agreed. The meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Steve McNellis, Director of Community and Economic Development.